



**CITY OF SAN DIEGO**

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT**

**TO THE:**

**CITY COUNCIL STRONG MAYOR-STRONG COUNCIL TRANSITION COMMITTEE**

Scott Peters, District 1, Chair  
District 2 - Vacant  
Toni Atkins, District 3 Councilmember  
Tony Young, District 4 Councilmember  
Brian Maienschein, District 5 Councilmember  
Donna Frye, District 6 Councilmember  
Jim Madaffer, District 7 Councilmember  
District 8 - Vacant

DATE: September 27, 2005

ATTENTION: City Council Transition Committee  
Meeting of September 28, 2005

SUBJECT: Redevelopment Agency under Proposition F

**SUMMARY**

Issues:

1. Should the Redevelopment Authority Bylaws be amended so that the voting procedures for the Redevelopment Agency mirror the provisions of Proposition F (including mayoral veto)?
2. Should the Mayor be identified in stead of the City Manager as Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency at least until a long term plan for the Redevelopment Authority has been fully evaluated by the PS&NS committee and the City Council?

## Issue #1

If the voting procedures of the Redevelopment Authority are not coordinated with those of the City Council, on January 1<sup>st</sup> each entity will have different voting requirements. Since some items which require Redevelopment Authority approval also have accompanying City Council approvals, this could lead to inconsistent outcomes. To avoid this and to make the procedures clearer to the public, the voting procedures should be consistent with each other. The Mayor's veto would not extend to matters that are exclusively within the purview of the members of the board (City Council).

**Chair's Recommendation: Coordinate the Redevelopment Authority's voting procedures to be consistent with the voting procedures of the Council under Proposition F.**

## Issue #2

Difficulties have developed in implementing the Transition Committee direction on August 4, 2005 to name someone other than the Manager or the Mayor as Executive Director of the Redevelopment Authority. The PS&NS committee has not completed its evaluation of alternative structures for the City's Redevelopment Agency. Consistent with other aspects of implementing Proposition F which give the Mayor control over duties currently assigned to the City Manager, the Mayor should oversee the Redevelopment Authority staff and act as its Executive Director at least until a decision regarding the ultimate structure of redevelopment has been made.

This action will not change the authority of the City Council acting alone to determine the future structure of the Redevelopment Authority or name its executive director.

**Chair's Recommendation: Name the Mayor as Executive Director of the Redevelopment Authority beginning on January 1, 2006 and ending on June 30, 2006.**

## DISCUSSION

### Voting Procedures for the Redevelopment Authority Board

Under our current form of government, the voting procedures for the Redevelopment Authority Board and the City Council are the same. This is because the Agency bylaws were written to implement the same voting procedures for the Agency as are now used by the Council. The essential difference between the two voting procedures is the inclusion of the Mayoral veto. Because the Redevelopment Authority voting procedures are dictated by the Agency's bylaws and not the City Charter, the bylaws would have to be amended to allow mayoral veto of Redevelopment Authority decisions. The City Attorney indicates that this would be allowed under California Redevelopment Law (CRL).

## Executive Director

At its last Meeting on August 4, 2005, the Strong Mayor Transition Committee discussed the implications of Proposition F on the City Redevelopment Process specifically related to the City's own Redevelopment Agency which administers all redevelopment areas within the City with the exception of Centre City and the Southeastern Redevelopment Areas. The City Attorney Report and Committee discussion addressed two main issues: 1) removal of the Mayor from the Redevelopment Agency Board and 2) the Manager's continued service as Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency Executive Director.

This first of these issues will be addressed with a simple change to the by-laws as they related to the members of the Agency Board.

Implementation of the Committee's direction regarding the second issue has proven more complicated. The Committee voted to designate someone other than the City Manager to serve as Executive Director of the Agency (an option provided for under the current bylaws). However, attempts to implement this proposal have raised additional questions necessitating a return to the Transition Committee for further direction. First: the Committee declined to initiate a search for either a new permanent or temporary Redevelopment Agency Executive Director. Second, it now appears that to name a member of the current managerial staff to that post would, after January 1, 2006, require concurrence of the Mayor because that staff person would now fall under the executive branch of the Mayor-Council form of government.

Though the PS&NS committee continues to evaluate alternative structures for the City Redevelopment Authority, it appears likely that no final decision will be implemented prior to January 1, 2006. This means that a workable structure with respect to the Executive Director must be developed even if only on a temporary basis which can be implemented when the Mayor-Council form of government takes place on January 1, 2006.

## CONCLUSION

The City Attorney has identified an additional issue related to the voting procedures for the Redevelopment Authority Board and recommends that the procedures of the Agency be coordinated with those of the City Council. Additionally, because of difficulties implementing the Committee's direction to identify someone other than the Manager or the Mayor as Executive Director of the Agency, it is recommended that the Mayor be identified instead of the City Manager.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Councilmember Scott Peters  
Chair, Council Transition Committee